



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,345	11/12/2003	David Chimitt	TN313	6037
7590 Unisys Corporation Attn: Michael B. Atlass Unisys Way, MS/E8-114 Blue Bell, PA 19424-0001		05/09/2007		
			EXAMINER PARK, ILWOO	
			ART UNIT 2182	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/706,345	Applicant(s) CHIMITT ET AL.	
	Examiner Ilwoo Park	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-9, 11-16 and 18-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the Remarks, Applicants argue in substance that Venkatesh lacks redirecting step; in other words, Venkatesh only discloses only one directing step in two different ways.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Venkatesh teaches the request is received by a first volume filter [one data mover], then directed to the appropriate meta-data extent [e.g., meta file system in figs.1 and 2 by meta file system manager 146 in fig. 9], and then the directed request is redirected to a second volume filter [other data mover that owns the file system in paragraph 0063] associated with the data extent.

2. Claims 1, 9, and 14 are amended in response to the last office action. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-25 are presented for examination. Venkatesh et al was cited in the last office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Venkatesh et al. [US 2003/0158836 A1].

As for claim 1, Venkatesh et al teach a method for processing input/output request packets (IRPs) directed to Data Volumes having a meta-data extent and at least one data extent [e.g., fig. 10], the method comprising the steps of:

receiving an initial IRP [e.g., paragraph 0061];

evaluating ["determining the data mover that owns the file system object" in paragraph 0063] the initial IRP by a first volume filter [one data mover] associated with the meta-data extent [e.g., meta file system in figs. 1 and 2 by meta file system manager 146 in fig. 9] to determine the meta-data extent to handle the IRP;

directing ["forwarding the request through the Virtual File System (VFS) to the meta file system manager 146 in one data mover" in paragraph 0062] the IRP by the first volume filter to the appropriate meta-data extent; and

redirecting ["forwarding the request to the data mover that owns the file system" in paragraph 0066] the IRP from the meta-data extent to a second volume filter ["other data mover that owns the file system" in paragraphs 0063, 0066] associated with the at least one data extent; and

returning a response [e.g., "obtaining metadata" in paragraph 0078] to the initial IRP from the second volume filter associated with the at least one data extent;

wherein the meta-data extent and at least one data extent comprise at least two logical drives ["plurality of file system cells" in paragraph 0010 and fig. 2]; and

the meta-data extent comprises configuration information [e.g., "volume label, ownership, access permission, time stamps, updates, consistency flag, etc." in paragraph 0033] for use in setting up and maintaining the Data Volumes.

5. As for claim 2, Venkatesh et al teach the IRP is initiated by an originator ['client' in paragraph 0061] of input/output (I/O).
6. As for claim 4, Venkatesh et al teach the meta-data extent is associated with a plurality of data extents [paragraph 0033].
7. As for claims 5, 11, and 24, Venkatesh et al teach the plurality of data extents are located on a plurality of physical disks [e.g., data storage 120-122 in fig. 8].
8. As for claim 7, Venkatesh et al teach creating additional IRPs by the volume filter, each additional IRP being derived from the initiated IRP and related to a single data extent [e.g., file lock request in order to obtain a lock, new metadata, and metadata version number in paragraph 0065, notification of a release of the lock in paragraph 0067].
9. As for claims 8 and 13, Venkatesh et al teach the meta-data extent and at least one data extent are Basic Volumes and the method is implemented above said Basic Volumes [figs. 1-2; paragraph 0035].
10. As for claim 9, Venkatesh et al teach a method for storing data across at least one physical disk and presenting the data as a single virtual disk [paragraph 0035], comprising the steps of:

forwarding [paragraph 0061] a first input/output request packet (IRP) from an originator of I/O to a first volume filter [one data mover] associated with a meta-data extent, the meta-data extent being associated with at least one data extent of a Data Volume;

intercepting ["forwarding the request through the Virtual File System to the meta file system manager" in paragraph 0062] the first IRP by the first volume filter associated with the mete-data extent;

creating an additional IRP [e.g., file lock request in order to obtain a lock, new metadata, and metadata version number in paragraph 0065, notification of a release of the lock in paragraph 0067] by the first volume filter for each data extent affected by the first IRP;

transmitting ["forwarding the request to the data mover that owns the file subsystem cell" in paragraph 0066] to a second volume filter associated with the additional IRPs to each data extent affected by the first IRP;

allowing the additional IRPs to pass through the second volume filter associated with volume filter of each data extent affected by the first IRP; and

returning a response ["obtaining metadata" in paragraph 0078] to the first IRP from the second volume filter associated with the at least one data extent to the originator.

11. As for claim 12, Venkatesh et al teach the data extents affected by the first IRP are located on separate physical disks [offline storage medium and online storage medium in paragraph 0077].

12. As for claim 14, Venkatesh et al teach a computer system for providing Data Volumes comprising:

a plurality of storage clients connected to at least one storage server across a computer network [fig. 8];

a plurality of magnetic disks wherein Data Volumes may be created [fig. 3] and virtually presented to said storage clients, each of Data Volumes having a meta-data extent and at least one data extent [fig. 2], the meta-data extent including a first volume filter [one data mover] adapted to redirect ["forwarding the request to the data mover that owns the file subsystem cell" in paragraph 0066] input/output request packets (IRPs) received from one of the storage clients to a second volume filter ["data mover that owns the file subsystem cell"] associated with the at least one data extent, said first volume filter configured to create an additional IRP [e.g., file lock request in order to obtain a lock, new metadata, and metadata version number in paragraph 0065, notification of a release of the lock in paragraph 0067] for each data extent affected by the IRP; the second volume filter associated with each of the at least one data extent returns a response ["obtaining metadata" in paragraph 0078] to the IRP; and

central management facility [e.g., control station 123 in fig. 8] for controlling the at least one storage server.

13. As for claim 16, Venkatesh et al teach each storage client is presented with a virtual disk including at least one Data Volume having a meta-data extent and at least one data extent [paragraph 0035; fig. 1].

14. As for claim 18, Venkatesh et al teach the at least one data extent is a plurality of data extents and the IRPs are redirected to the data extents based on which data extents are affected by the IRPs [e.g., pointer of the object for accessing the object in paragraphs 0072, 0073, sending a file lock request using file system ID in figs. 10 and 13].

15. As for claim 19, Venkatesh et al teach each storage client is presented with a particular Date Volume having a meta-data extent and at least one data extent [paragraph 0035; fig. 1].

16. As for claim 20, Venkatesh et al teach the Date Volume is a simple volume [fig. 1].

17. As for claim 21, Venkatesh et al teach the Date Volume is a spanned volume [fig. 1].

18. As for claims 22 and 25, Venkatesh et al teach the Date Volume includes at least three Basic Volumes and a volume filter is logically disposed above said Basic volumes [figs. 2 and 9].

19. As for claim 23, Venkatesh et al teach a volume filter for redirecting input/output request packets (IRPs) sent from an input/output (I/O) originator, the volume filter comprising:

intercepting means ["forwarding the request through the Virtual File System to the meta file system manager" in paragraph 0062] for intercepting IRPs sent to a meta-data extent associated with a Basic Volume;

evaluating means ["determining the data mover that owns the file system object" in paragraph 0063] for evaluating IRPs to determine a meta-data extent to handle the IRP; and

redirecting means [VFS forwarding the request from the meta file system manager 146 in one data mover to MPFS 152 for the other data mover that owns the file subsystem cell' in paragraph 0066 and figs. 9-10] for redirecting the IRPs to at least

one data extent associated with at least one other Basic Volume wherein a plurality of data extents are associated [fig. 8; paragraph 0010] with an equal number of Basic Volumes; and

creating means for creating an additional IRP [e.g., file lock request in order to obtain a lock, new metadata, and metadata version number in paragraph 0065, notification of a release of the lock in paragraph 0067] for each data extent affected by a redirected IRP.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatesh et al. [US 2003/0158836 A1] in view of well known in the art.

As for claim 3, Venkatesh et al do not disclose the originator of I/O is a Small Computer Interface Target Mode Driver (SCSITMD); however, a Small Computer Interface Target Mode Driver (SCSITMD) for issuing an I/O request for file access is well known in the art. At the time the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the Small Computer Interface Target Mode Driver (SCSITMD) for issuing an I/O request in order to increase applicability for adapting prevalent SCSI connection for accessing files.

As for claim 15, Venkatesh et al do not disclose the computer network is a fibre channel network; however, computer network including a fibre channel network for accessing files in a storage is well known in the art. At the time the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a fibre channel network in order to increase applicability for adapting prevalent fibre channel network for accessing files.

Conclusion

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ilwoo Park whose telephone number is (571) 272-4155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for

Art Unit: 2182

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ILWOO PARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Ilwoo Park
Ilwoo Park

May 2, 2007